

ATTACHMENT 3

Foreign Policy Section of Gamal Abdel-Nasser's
Speech to Army Officers on 28 March 1955

The reproduction is a composite of the text appearing in Al Ahram of 1 April and a rebroadcast of the "Foreign Policy" section of the speech which was carried over the Egyptian State Broadcasting System on 31 March.

Words in () were not in broadcast text. Words in [] were not in Al Ahram text. Words underlined were in English in broadcast, in Arabic in Al Ahram.

[We have been in an area of British influence as a result of occupation and it is difficult to get out from under the influence. We will need all our great resources, strength, and patience to achieve that before speaking about the political and foreign policy. Let me speak now of our international position in connection to political and strategic aspects.

The world - and this will affect our small country and our population of 23 million - around us is divided into the Eastern and Western blocs, the Eastern Bloc under the leadership of Russia and the Western under the leadership of the United States. Each of these blocs has as its main aim the gathering of the greatest number of people and nations under its control.

The Western Bloc since the Cold War began in 1947 began to think of achieving its objectives by surrounding Russia with a belt of alliances. The West began to make agreements and alliances of the nations with Western leanings. On the other hand the Eastern Bloc - that is the Communist camp - began to prepare revolutions in nations under Western control or in agreement with the West in order to break through the Western influence.

Let us take a glance at the military pacts made by the United States: (1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to defend Northern Europe and the Atlantic, (2) The Balkan Pact, (3) The United States agreement with Spain for Mutual Defense - this treaty is considered complementary to NATO, (4) The Agreements in North Africa - also complementary to NATO.

They started to negotiate the Turko-Pakistani Pact which they thought would be useful to complete the defense belt of alliances by extending it to meet with the Far East. Last year the Pacific Treaty was organized and this year the Manila pact followed. The last two treaties which included the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Formosa, Pakistan, etc., were for the purpose of defending the Pacific area, South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia.

*****The Radio Commentator interrupted the speech to point out that Premier Nasser was checking some maps.***

The basic American policy then is to build a chain of defensive treaties around Russia, this was almost completed by the Paris agreements in which Great Britain, France, West Germany and the United States participated. The agreement implies the armament of the German Western Republic and agreement between France and the German Western Republic on the Saar. The unity of Germany was also decided upon. At the conference of Foreign Ministers, Russia did not agree and threatened to break with France. Other nations saw that the move for German unity was apparently illusory because of the division of Germany and thought that such unity should be carried out under United Nations supervision. Russia began to fight this move to arm Germany. It made certain agreements in which Poland, Czechoslovakia and East Germany figured in order to strengthen their position. The struggle is getting more bitter and the cold war between the two blocs is getting worse every day.

From the military standpoint, let us look at the strength of each bloc. The Atlantic pact is supposed to have 100 divisions. The European Army comprises Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg. Germany is allotted 12 divisions and France has not been able to meet its military requirements of twenty divisions because it claims the Indo-Chinese war has drawn heavily on it. The situation is still unstable.

On the other hand Russia can mobilize 100 divisions in 30 days; China can immediately bring 175 divisions on to the battlefield; other European satellites can bring together 60 divisions. Thus the Atlantic Pact with a possible 100 divisions can not stand against this formidable power. Thus the future will not take the shape we think it will, nor will it depend on war as we know it.

Here again the commentator interrupted...

The aim of the Western bloc from these treaties is well known. With these treaties they mean to tell Russia the following:

Aggression against any of these nations will start a World War. The treaties aim at stopping Russian expansion; they intend to arouse fear and stop the Russians at their frontiers. The results of these treaties will be a Third World War.

Let us review the position of South East Asia as a result of these treaties. In Vietnam the Communists are still strong; in Thailand, Laos, and Cambodia, guerrilla warfare is still going on; in Malaya, guerrilla warfare is also evident under Communist direction; in Indonesia the situation is unstable with the Chinese doing their best to influence it; the Philippines and Japan are under direct American influence; Burma, Afghanistan, and India are neutral and do not stand with any bloc.

The Near East is still the weak link in connection with completion of the Northern Defense Belt. With the Zahedi government in Iran, Iran has been brought once again under Western influence. The entire operation is based on linking the states with a series of treaties + Defense agreements - in order to block Communist expansion which would result in a Third World War.

Let us look at the operation in connection with China and Formosa. Nationalist China and Formosa have received six hundred billion dollars from the United States and still did not succeed in keeping the Communists out. Then China began to invade the Tachen Islands, Britain immediately announced it would not get itself into a Third World War. This created a rift between the United States and Britain. The United States answered by sending the U.S. Seventh Fleet to the Pescadores to defend Formosa.

Thus the operation in connection with China and the Far East took on the aspect of the cold war. China thinks that Formosa and Korea with American influence are a threat to it. China has not forgotten that Japan invaded it through Korea and Manchuria. The position in the Far East still is unstable. In Indonesia there is also a cold war with pressure from both East and West.

I think that the next war, if it were to start between the major powers, will depend not on land forces but on air supremacy.

In Churchill's White Paper on strategic defense by atomic energy, we find that Britain had decided to make the H-bomb. During the last war Britain and the United States had coordinated and cooperated on their atomic research. In 1946 the United States passed a law on non-cooperation on Atomic Energy Research with other nations and thus after the world war the United States undertook the making of the H-bomb by itself. Russia also announced that it would make atom and hydrogen bombs.

There is definite disagreement between America and Britain on strategic policy. In spite of American bases in Britain, Britain has no influence on Air Strategy. The United States gives priority to its rocket bases in the Arctic; Britain on the other hand gives priority to the air bases in Europe from which Russia could make definite attacks from Europe on Britain which would be in the front line.

Eisenhower believes that the strategic importance of Europe is not easy to take advantage of and he was thus thinking of occupying Cherbourg in order to use it to re-invade Europe if it were occupied by Russians. However, work is being done on strengthening NATO, to be the defensive force of the area, the main obstacle, France which is very weak.

Of course if we look at the White Paper we find only ink on paper. The British say "we will do that" and "we will do this," but nothing has been done.

Britain thinks that it has one thing in common with Russia and that is in atomic bomb production. The United States may have superiority in atomic and hydrogen bombs. But Churchill in his White Paper said Russia will be able to reach United States' atomic superiority by 1958 or 1959.

Making the bomb is not the only solution. Transporting it is also a main problem. That problem is still being worked on in Russia, in spite of the fact that Russia has built some types of planes to transport it.

Here then is the dispute between the British and the United States--the dispute on arms production and coordination and the development of research and priority to be given to arms production for time of war. The Western bloc believes the same thing is true in connection with China and Russia.

After we have found out what goes on in the world we should find out what goes on in our own region, that is the region of the Middle East. We find in this region a spirit of liberation, that is, we find this spirit among the peoples but not among some Governments.

When we go back to the years 1950 and 1951 we find that the Western States had tried to fill the gap by finding a way to organize the defense of the Middle East. None of the Governments which then existed in the area could accept this plan - this is, an agreement for joint defense - for one reason: the hatred which was so strong after Palestine and its tragedy, which had had its effect upon the Arabs who felt that the West with whom they had always cooperated had not kept its promises to them. The Arabs cooperated with the West during the First World War, but after the war the West broke all the promises it had made to King Hussein and the Arabs who worked with and helped the West. As a result the Arab region did not achieve its independence but was turned into colonies and divided between Britain and France.

After the Second World War conditions remained the same as before. All that happened was the liberation of Syria and Lebanon. Probably you have read in the Yalta papers the reason why they were liberated. The West wanted to oust France from a position of international influence. The Big Powers found that this was their chance. Thus the purpose of independence and assistance was not the liberation of the two countries, but the reduction of French influence and the making of France a second or third rate state.

After the liberation of Lebanon and Syria came the loss of Palestine which they gave to Israel... Because of this the West was not able to organize the defense of this area.

They used to consider Egypt as the key factor in this matter - that were Egypt to approve (the joint defense) this aspect of the plan they had put forward, the defense of this area would be organized in the interest of the West.

In their view the defense of this region must be organized, but we explained to them our point of view throughout the negotiations. We told them once again that we could not accept the Middle East Defense Pact.... The truth is that the problem has not merely been one of terminology, but it has a broader basis - this kind of defense is entirely directed against Communism.

Communism has been considered a danger, but I still believe that imperialism or domination of us by the other side represents another danger.

We are a state which lived under the yoke of imperialism for 75 years in the form of the British (occupation) colonization. Before the British (occupation) colonization we had Turkish colonization for 300 or 400 years. We have got rid of the British occupation by an agreement for the occupation of the base for seven years. This means that we have an obligation. If war should break out, they will come to occupy the base. But we consider this a minor obligation whereas in the case of an alliance or organization for the defense of the Middle East we would (be tied by) enter into other obligations. I am not sure that my present position is such that I would be able to remain sovereign if I were to accept such additional obligations.

I consider that Egypt at present, now that she is beginning one phase of liberation, must rid herself completely of every foreign influence so that she can stand on her own feet. After that, if she finds that it is in her interest to conclude an agreement with another state on a basis of equality, she will conclude that agreement to further her interests; but she will never do so as a result of pressure. She will not join if she feels she is not strong, and in the economic sphere we are not strong and possibly in the spheres of guiding and directing we have not yet become strong.

There are some who say that as far as the economic sphere is concerned we can depend on foreign sources. In reply to this I say that if we want to build our national economy on a sound foundation we must depend totally on ourselves.

The forty million dollars we received last year from America as aid we used not to build our economy but for public services. We can say we can do without it. We used it for roads, for port development, and to shorten the time which it would have taken to provide the villages with clean water. We never built our national economy on it.

I find Turkey is fundamentally facing a serious economic crisis. Her existence depends on foreign aid - on American assistance. It is so easy to tell her to do anything. If the Premier says no, assistance will be stopped. Turkey has become completely bound up like an American state. The Premier can do nothing nor can he agree to take part in the Jakarta Conference before he has held consultations because his policy has come under "domination" because he is inside this ring.

Now our position is different because we are passing through a decisive period of our history. We consider that if this decisive period is not properly oriented we will not be able to attain the special goal of the Revolution, the achievement of a socialist society in which the standard of living is raised and the country is strengthened economically and productively.

We said in our statement during the negotiations that we were prepared to organize the defense of the Middle East. But on what basis? We said to them, "Defense must emanate from the region. The defense of the region must come from the strengths of its sons. We have the Collective Security Pact. All the Arab States are members of the Pact

and we are ready to strengthen it - just give us weapons. If we are attacked we will defend ourselves and you will find in this area Arab forces capable of shouldering this duty without any (alliance) link with the West and without any (pressure from) partnership with the West. And in this way we will also be reassured about the other danger.

"You want a defense against the communist danger; we too are not complacent regarding the communist danger. But we fear western domination as well as the communist danger, and on this ground the defense of this area must come from the States of the area and from its sons without any foreign intervention. If you consider that arming us will be consistent with your interests in any way, then (make it easy for us to arm) give us arms."

In April 1953 the American Secretary of State paid us a visit and we discussed this question with him. He insisted on Middle East defense in which Britain and American would take part. We rejected this plan completely.

We said to him: "We are ready to form a combined Command and a United army of our own, because if I were to join a Combined Command with Britain and America I would be only a puppet compared to them. There would be persons in the combined Command drawing salaries, but the work of the Joint Command will depend on the words of those who have the influence. Then when they have become the whole show, they will bring back the story of the British military mission. You know that the British Military Mission did to the Egyptian army.

"They will have all the influence. They will bring money and weapons, they will put forward the plans and the rest will say 'Yes Sir'."

"For this reason our people will absolutely refuse."

They said that the Collective Security Pact is nothing but ink on paper. We told them we were ready to strengthen it if they were to give us arms with which the pact could defend the region.

"Don't try to sweep the states of the region out of your way because I personally believe that if the states of the area or some of them will go with the current this will affect the strength of the whole area."

But the only thing that interests them in this area is filling a gap. This gap lies between Pakistan and Turkey, that is ultimately Afghanistan and Iran. They consider Iran will not be in deep enough unless Iraq joins them.

Therefore they are concerned about defense and we are concerned about our freedom. We were colonized, our country was occupied, and our progress which was vital to us was left to run on haphazardly so that the people would become weak.

All we want today is to create for ourselves an independent personality which will be strong and not dependant, which will be free to direct its domestic policy the way it wants and direct its foreign policy in a way which serves its interests.

I do not want to ask others what I should do in any matter. I give my representative at the United Nations basic principles and I tell him "Act on these principles." I am not afraid or hesitant to give my opinion freely. Our principles at the United Nations which we gave to Dr. Mahmoud Azad (Allah be merciful to him) are:

- We are for self determination
- We are against imperialism (and foreign domination)
- We are for the freedom of peoples.

This is the path we can take, but we cannot take it if there is domination over us.

We cannot say our views about world problems freely.

For example, when the Cyprus question was discussed we announced our views about it freely. We said that we favored the principle of self-determination. Had I been dominated or bound I would have had to have gone and asked the British Ambassador saying: "Our interests are identical and our foreign policy is linked together, what must I say?" And he would say, "We want Cyprus to remain in its present status under British domination." And then I would have gone to the United Nations and voted with Britain. This is how Turkey operates today.

We believe that in such a situation we are entering a major battle, for our goal, which is to have a free and independent personality.

Tito in Yugoslavia tried to arrive by the other road. He went with Russia until 1948 and actually he was able to obtain an economic revival in his country; then he tried to disagree with the (policy) orders which came to him from Russia. This they didn't permit him to do. They had a dispute and all the economic ties which bound Yugoslavia to Russia were severed. There was a collapse in Yugoslavia and Yugoslavia got out of this crisis only with difficulty because the strong rule at the expense of the people; then Tito began to straighten out conditions in his country.

We in this area look at the question from two aspects:

1. Egypt wants to protect herself against any act of treachery on condition that
2. she preserves her entity, personality, independence and freedom. I will not allow my country to come under any form of domination.

We thought we could attain both things together, that is by organizing the defense of Egypt through the Arab Collective Security Pact. If the West had found this in its interest it would have (been easy for us to arm) armed us and we would have preserved our independence and personality in both domestic and foreign spheres without any foreign domination.

But the West considered that this would not accomplish their goal of completing the chain around Russia.

We got in touch with the Arab States; Salah Salem went to Iraq and met the King of Iraq, the Iraqi Crown Prince and the Premier of Iraq. He discussed with them the strengthening of the Arab Collective Security Pact, the Arab bloc, fraternal union, etc.

And in accordance with tradition and the rules of courtesy sweet words were said, dinnerparties held, and nice receptions given, and they said "Yes" and "at your service" and "we really want to strengthen the Collective Security Pact."

Salah came back from Iraq with the understanding that Iraq agreed to strengthen the Collective Security Pact. We considered this was a splendid victory, for how had Iraq been able to arrive at such a position under Nouri As-Said.

Nouri then came to Egypt and we started discussing with him the strengthening of the Collective Security Pact. He said: "Yes. This is a great step which we must take. You must take it and we are with you hand in hand." We told him: "How should the Collective Security Pact be strengthened?"

He said: "I think we should call in the British and American Ambassadors and tell them we want to strengthen the Collective Security Pact saying 'what (ways) do you suggest?'"

I told him: "I knew what (ways) they would suggest for I have spent two years discussing this subject with them and if I ask them this now it will be considered the beginning of new talks and discussions on this matter. What I want to know is your point of view."

After some perplexity and attempts to dodge an answer, he said: "The way to strengthen the Collective Security Pact is to expand the Pact which is now limited to the Arab States."

I said: "How do we expand the Pact?"

He said: "By adding Pakistan."

I said: "What benefit do we get from including Pakistan?"

He said: "There is the Communist danger to us. We want to stand up to the Communist danger."

I said: "What good can Pakistan be when she has only five divisions? Half of them look after internal security and the second half is not fully armed. They are in the front line and it is presumed that the function of the back areas is to rescue those in front. They have Karachi on a harbor and it is probably the only exit from which to send you troops. (The rear ranks are supposed to rescue the front lines. It's not up to the rear to save the center.)"

He said: "Forget Pakistan. We'll get Turkey in."

I said: "Suppose there is a Communist attack. You want to get Turkey in. Do you think Turkey with its 15 divisions can spare a single soldier to send you? Turkey will want your help because you are at its rear."

He said: "Forget Turkey."

When I said to him, "Pakistan and Turkey cannot help you," he said:

"Forget Turkey. Let's conclude an alliance with those who can really help us. Let's conclude an alliance with Britain and America. Forget France. Let us conclude an alliance with American, Britain, Turkey, Iran, Pakistan - with all of them and expand the Collective Security Pact. This way we will insure the supply of arms and we'll be practical and.... and.... This idea about Arab nationalism which we're always talking about - what's Jordan and what's Syria and what are the Arabs... I do not believe in all this talk."

I told him: "We cannot follow this path. We consider the participation of any of the big powers in the defense of this area might restrict the trend towards freedom we are following. We want to establish our position, and strengthen our personality, we want a defense which emanates from this area."

And we did not agree.

But he wrote a communique saying we had agreed on all points.

I told him: "This cannot be."

He said: "We must issue a communique in this form."

I said: "We cannot issue a communique saying we have reached an agreement." So we issued the obscure communique which had no meaning. It was published and you read it.

Kouiri As-Said left. He went here and there to have talks. Kouiri As-Said has a long record for such things. A record which is the result of a special for general philosophy which he expounded in a letter which he sent in 1942 to Mr. Casey, British Minister of State. In that letter he considered that it was the States of the Fertile Crescent, that is, Jordan, Syria, and Iraq, which were the states which could form one unit, and who could form the Arab League and that Egypt did not come within the orbit of the Arabs.

In Egypt we held to our theory and philosophy of defense. We tried by all ways and means to be persuasive, but the others - (the West) tried by all ways and means to complete the northern armor which they considered to be incomplete.

They spoke to us about military and economic assistance and they said "we will give you all this". We told them "we will accept military assistance but don't impose conditions on us. We are not ready to sign on the six or seven conditions with which you bind nations. Help us militarily and naturally we will not use the arms except first for legitimate defense second in the service of the free world" - and there were some other obligations. They said, "we will give you American weapons without signing (the conditions)."

We told them: "no. We want weapons and we will pay for them. the subject. Sign a letter." We said, "No, we want you to give us weapons and we will pay the price." If you want to help us you could put a different price on the weapons." That is, every weapon has a price and a second, third, or fourth price when they sell. This means that prices are not fixed. So help us in this matter." They said, "we will give weapons worth 20 million dollars in 1954-55."

They made us feel dizzy but up to now this drawn-out operations has resulted only in sweet talk.

We said to them, "We are ready to buy." How are we going to buy weapons? Reduce the price for us. They said they were ready but the only results we have reached with them was that weapons would come. I told you this two years ago. A mission composed of Ali-Baklawi and Ali Sabri went there. Negotiations lasted a long time but with no results.

The Jewish and Zionist influence is very strong there and I had believed that it would really have been a miracle if we had gotten anything.

We always said and we still say that the organization of the defense of this area will not be completed unless the Arab States as a defense organization are given full opportunity to arm and build a purely Arab army for their defense in accordance with the Collective Security Pact.

Naturally this opinion does not fall in line with the other plans. These are the plans which insist on alliances and the results of such an alliance would be that in case of an attack it would lead to a world war in which atomic bombs will be used. Against the mountain passes in these regions.

Then the Iraqi announcement of January 12, 1955 took us by surprise.

There was a meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs last December and I had met with them one by one. I talked to them about building an Arab army to defend the Arabs, which would be our army and would be run by us. They all accepted this view and the most enthusiastic was Shabbandar, the Iraqi Minister of Foreign Affairs. He proposed to us that Iraq conclude an evacuation agreement with Britain similar to the Egyptian agreement with the difference that it include Iran and Turkey instead of Turkey only, that is in the event of an attack on Turkey or Iran British troops would reoccupy Habbaniya and Shiyba airports in Iraq.

I said to him, "no objection", and he replied, "After that we will strengthen the Collective Security Pact. Nouri As-Said is now convinced by your views and ideas. He will not conclude an alliance with Pakistan nor with Iran, nor with anyone. He only hopes now to strengthen the Arab Pact. That was on December 15, 1954. We decided to recommend that none of the Arab States should conclude any alliance but that they should depend on the Arab Pact and all the Ministers signed.

Then the Turko-Iraqi Pact was announced on January 12, 1955, and the other Arab States were invited to join.

The truth is that we consider this matter the solution of all the problems of the West in this region, especially the pending Arab problems. But flinging ourselves into their arms in this manner will make us [nearly] lose our personality, and we will have lost our independence except for limited and specific domestic issues and our countries will have been made a battlefield (on which we must [without a chance to] defend ourselves.

The West will defend this area with atom bombs, but I who live here, I who exist in this region, how will I defend myself? How will I defend myself when (planes bring me hydrogen or atom bombs) [the 'Tactical Air Forces' come to close the mountain passes or planes close the passes with hydrogen or atom bombs. Is not this a delaying operation to hold up the advance?] I who live in this region which is my country, what can I do?

All these are matters which we must think of. We have all discussed these matters. We said to them, "You will defend this area with planes and atom bombs. Suppose you fail - will you leave us like this in the field?" We said to them: "The only solution is to establish a purely Arab defense organization which is strong and is not tied to the West. With this the enemy will think more than ten times before he attacks this area. If this area [where a vacuum exists] is left a vacuum, it encourages attack, but if this region has an army of its sons it will make the aggressor hesitate before he launches an attack. We, the Arabs of this region, can maintain 15 divisions [as there are 50 million Arabs]".

This theory was not accepted.

Iraq joined the Turkish Pact and considered the Pact a guarantee against invasion. When I sat discussing the matter with Rash Ayan he approved Egypt's views and said "the truth is that they put pressure on us."

I said to him: "Why did you give in? You were an independent statesman and had a national front before you became a Minister, why has the world changed?"

He said: "We are practical. We were nationalists, and we have become practical. The truth is that there is pressure on us."

This is how (the West is) [they are] working to bring about a separationist policy in this area and a policy of cleavage because they realize that the presence of Egyptians there will be one of the factors which will weaken their influence. We have welcomed missions and sent teachers there, but now this is naturally meeting resistance.

If we turn our heads to the south of Egypt - to the Sudan - we find a war going on in which we have won the first round, [the elections,] but all the conflicting (imperialist) forces are working against us in the Sudan, one reason being that if Egypt reaches Malakal and the South Sudan, the Central Africa n Federation and the colonies there will be infected with the Egyptian spirit of liberation. In other words (the imperialists consider Egypt's arrival in the South Sudan and entry into Central Africa a danger.) [the arrival of Egyptians in the Southern Sudan is a danger to the British Empire which is allied with France, Ethiopia, and Belgium who have designs in the Sudan.]

Bitter war still rages between us and all the forces in the Sudan. All their help and all their resistance seeks to strengthen the (separationists) [them] on the basis that the Sudan will become independent. The truth is that the Sudan will not become independent in this way, because the (separationists) [them] have always been tied to the British and if the Sudan becomes independent through them then British influence will be there.

We are fighting bitter battles in the South, bitter battles in the West and in the East stands Israel.

We are not waging those battles because we love to attack. To us all those battles are defensive.

We have gone along our path having as our principle Arab defense by the Arabs. So long as Iraq has left us, let there be a new alliance of the rest of the Arab States. Let the principle continue and Arab strength will be found, an entity which will owe its existence to this principle.

I would not be surprised if the latest Israeli actions were agreed to by Ben Gurion on the basis of an understanding between them and Britain and France in the year 1950 which deals with supplying Israel with weapons if Israel is subjected to an Arab attack. Naturally we cannot say that Israel is not under the influence of the West. They consider Israel as a source of trouble and threats to us.

If, God willing, we want to have an independent personality and develop it in the critical period we are in, we must steel ourselves. Our revolution calls for liberation and independence. This means liberation internally and externally and that we have an entity and an influence on what goes on around us. To achieve this we must hold steadfast. If we give in to authority and run after mirages and glittering words we will lose our personality and our nationalism and attain what we do not want or like.

Our Revolution does not accept this and for this reason we are fighting in the Arab zone and in the African zone and in all this region. It is to be regretted that we fight not only foreign forces but also the agents of the imperialists in those areas. As long as there are agents of imperialism, they will believe that they derived their influence from that of the foreigners, and always that type of people has influence as was the case here and therefore we face great powers of resistance. We will do our duty on all fronts. We will neither feel weak or subdued but at the same time we will develop a strong personality for ourselves.

(The West) ~~They~~ now feel(s) that (it has) ~~they have~~ accomplished part of (its) their goal, that is the Northern Chain, ~~Turkey~~ and Iraq but they also know that depth - and that is the important part with respect to this chain - has not been achieved on the question of the base. The base in Suez is the focal point in case of an attack on one of the Arab States or Turkey. How will the base come into operation when there is Israel and there is the state of war existing between the Arabs and Israel.

This situation must therefore be changed so the base can be a base. The base should be transferred from its present position if the situation remains as it is. This ^{is} what they (are) ~~were~~ thinking of.

These are problems which we must face. Our principal purpose is to have our own personality and entity and achieve for our country internal independence and have our foreign policy a free national policy.

There may be some who have an inferiority complex and who will be afraid because past circumstances domination called for fear, especially when we remember that the British Ambassador in Cairo used to issue orders and instructions. We do not want this history to be ever repeated.